

Remarks

I. Status of claims

Claims 1-30 are pending.

Claims 1 and 12 are independent claims.

Claims 2-11 and 21-30 depend from independent claim 1.

Claims 13-20 depend from independent claim 12.

II. Claim rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Fifield (U.S. 6,178,512).

III. Interview Summary Record

In a telephone conference on October 18, 2005, the Examiner and Mr. Garcia (undersigned) reviewed the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Fifield. In the course of this review, the Examiner and Mr. Garcia discussed the relevance of Fifield's disclosure to the inventions defined by independent claims 1 and 12.

With respect to independent claim 12, Mr. Garcia explained that Fifield does not teach or suggest anything about a controller that is configured to authorize wireless transmission of a transfer file (which includes meta-data containing permissions information restricting rendering of a particular digital content by a third party device) to the third party device in accordance with meta-data associated with the particular digital content and without regard to any identifier of the third party device, as recited in claim 1. In response to this explanation, the Examiner said that she agreed that Fifield does not teach or suggest all of the elements of independent claim 1.

With respect to independent claim 12, Mr. Garcia explained that in addition to not teaching or suggesting the features in common with independent claim 1, Fifield also does not teach or suggest anything about a license manager configured to allocate an incentive having an exchangeable pecuniary value to a first user of a portable media device licensed to transmit a particular digital content in response to receipt of an indication of a purchase of a

Applicant : Gary D. Sasaki et al.
Serial No. : 09/741,725
Filed : December 19, 2000
Page : 9 of 9

Attorney's Docket No.: 10004124-1
Amendment dated Oct. 18, 2005
Reply to Office action dated September 14, 2005

license for the particular digital content by a second user of a portable media device who received a copy of the particular digital content from the first user, as recited in claim 12. In response to this explanation, the Examiner said that she agreed that Fifield does not teach or suggest all of the elements of independent claim 12.

At the conclusion of the telephone conference, the Examiner stated to Mr. Garcia that she would allow all of the pending claims 1-30.


IV. Conclusion

For the reasons explained above, all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance and should be allowed.

Charge any excess fees or apply any credits to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 18, 2005



Edouard Garcia
Reg. No. 38,461
Telephone No.: (650) 631-6591

Please direct all correspondence to:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Department, M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80528-9599